IN THE HIGH COURT OF KERALA AT ERNAKULAM

PRESENT :

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE A.K.BASHEER

TUESDAY, THE 10TH JULY 2007 / 19TH ASHADHA 1929

WP(C).No. 19550 of 2007(B)

PETITIONER:

P.R.PRAKASAN,
POCHAYIL VEEDU, ULIYAKOVIL P.O., KOLLAM EAST,
NOW RESIDING AT KANAKAVILAS, KILIKOLLOOR P.O.,
KOLLAM. (INSPECTOR, RETIRED, KSRTC, KOLLAM).

BY ADV. SRI.ANANDARAJAN.N
SRI.C.V.MILTON

RESPONDENTS:

1. THE KERALA STATE ROAD TRANSPORT CORPORATION, REPRESENTED BY ITS MANAGING DIRECTOR, TRANSPORT BHAVAN, FORT P.O., THIRUVANANTHAPURAM-23.

2. THE FINANCIAL ADVISOR AND CHIEF ACCOUNTS OFFICER, KERALA STATE ROAD TRANSPORT CORPORATION, TRANSPORT BHAVAN, FORT P.O., THIRUVANANTHAPURAM-23.

3. THE ASSISTANT PERSONAL OFFICER(PENSION), KERALA STATE ROAD TRANSPORT CORPORATION, TRANSPORT BHAVAN, FORT P.O., THIRUVANANTHAPURAM-23.

4. THE DISTRICT TRANSPORT OFFICER, K.S.R.T.C., KOLLAM.

Addl.R5. THE SALE OFFICER,
THE KOLLAM CO-OPERATIVE AGRICULTURAL & RURAL DEVELOPMENT BANK LTD. NO.Q 167, KOLLAM 691 001.
(Additional respondent no.5 impleaded as per order in I.A.9424//07 dated 10.7.2007)

BY ADV. SRI.K.PRABHAKARAN, SC, K.S.R.T.C.

THIS WRIT PETITION (CIVIL) HAVING COME UP FOR ADMISSION ON 10/07/2007, THE COURT ON THE SAME DAY DELIVERED THE FOLLOWING:

A.K.BASHEER, J.

W.P.(C)No.19550 OF 2007

Dated this the 10th day of July, 2007

JUDGMENT

Petitioner had retired from the service of the Kerala State Road Transport Corporation on superannuation on February 28, 2006. His grievance is that the Death Cum Retirement Gratuity payable to him is being withheld by the Corporation without any justifiable reasons.

2. A Division Bench of this court in Writ Appeal No. 289/2001 had issued certain directions and guidelines in the matter of disbursement of the benefits to the retired employees of the Corporation. It is the admitted position that the Corporation has disbursed the benefits only to those employees who had retired upto June 2004. There are thousands of other employees who had retired even prior to the retirement of the petitioner and they are waiting in the queue to get the same relief. In that view of the matter, petitioner is also bound to await his turn.

3. I do not find any extenuating circumstance to allow the petitioner to break the queue. Though it is brought to my notice that Ext.P2 notice has been issued to him from a Bank at Kollam directing him to discharge the liability payable to the said Bank, still I am not satisfied that the petitioner is entitled to get out of turn payment.

Therefore, the writ petition is dismissed.

A.K.BASHEER, JUDGE

jes